

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROCK HILL DIVISION

Dwight Xavier Jones,
Plaintiff,

C.A. No.: 0:11-cv-00754-RBH-PJG

vs.

)

ORDER

)

Melody James, Cayce Magistrate Court)
Judge; Major Quig, Lexington County)
Detention Center; Patsy McDaniel,)
Lexington County Detention Center;)
Captain Ronald O'Neil, Lexington County)
Detention Center; Cayce Public Safety;
PSO Bradacs;

Defendants.

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, brought this suit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation.¹ In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is

ORDERED that the Complaint is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process as to Defendants Melody James and Cayce Public Safety.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina
October 18, 2011

¹ The court notes that while Plaintiff filed several letters shortly after the Magistrate Judge issued her R & R, nowhere in the letters does Plaintiff appear to object to her recommendation of dismissal as to Defendants James and Cayce Public Safety. *See, e.g.*, Notice [Docket Entry 15]; Letter [Docket Entry 16]; Letter II [Docket Entry 19]; Letter III [Docket Entry 20]. Regardless, upon review, it appears that dismissal of these two defendants is appropriate.